	Case 1:24-cv-00672-JLT-EPG	Document 11	Filed 02/27/25	Page 1 of 2					
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT								
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
10									
11	DEREK M. SMITH,	C	ase No. 1:24-cv-006	572 JLT EPG (PC)					
12	Plaintiff,		ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND						
13	v.	P	RECOMMENDATIONS, REVOKING PLAINTIFF'S <i>IN FORMA PAUPERIS</i>						
14	FRESNO COUNTY JAIL,	T	STATUS, AND DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO PAY THE FILING FEE IN FULL WITHIN						
15	Defendant.		30 DAYS						
16			Oocs. 7, 8, 10)						
17	Previously, the Court granted Derek Smith's request to proceed in forma pauperis in this								
18	action. However, upon review of Plaintiff's litigation history, the assigned magistrate judge								
19	found Plaintiff is subject to the three strikes bar of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), based upon four actions								
20	that were dismissed prior to the filing of this matter. (Doc. 10 at 3.) The magistrate judge also								
21	found that Plaintiff's allegations "are insufficient to show that there is a real and imminent threat								
22	to Plaintiff's personal safety." (Id. at 5.) Thus, the magistrate judge found the imminent danger								
23	exception to Section 1915 does not apply. (Id.) The magistrate judge recommended the Court								
24	revoke Plaintiff's in forma pauperis status and direct Plaintiff to pay the filing fee in full. (Id.)								
25	The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff and notified him that								
26	any objections were due within 30 days. (Doc. 10 at 5.) The Court advised Plaintiff that the								
27	"failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal."								
28	(Id. at 6, citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838–39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff did not file								

	Case 1:24-cv	/-00672-JLT-EPG	Document 11	Filed 02/27/25	Page 2 of 2			
1	any objections and the time to do so has passed.							
2	According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a <i>de novo</i> review of this case.							
3	Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Plaintiff is not entitled to proceed							
4	in forma pauperis in this matter because Plaintiff has at least three dismissals that qualify as							
5	strikes under Section 1915(g), and he does not satisfy the imminent danger exception. Thus, the							
6	Court ORDERS:							
7	1.	1. The Findings and Recommendations filed on January 21, 2025 (Doc. 10) are						
8	ADOPTED in full.							
9	2.	2. Plaintiff's in forma pauperis status is REVOKED .						
10	3.	Within 30 days fro	m the date of servi	ice of this order, Pla	aintiff SHALL pay in	full		
11	the \$405.00 filing fee if he wishes to proceed with his action.							
12	Plaintiff is advised that failure to pay the required filing fee as ordered will result in							
13	the dismissal of this action without prejudice.							
14		DEDED						
15	IT IS SO OR	(DERED.		Olivai III	Musslm			
16	Dated:	February 27, 20	<u>25</u>	UNITED STA	<u> </u>	<u>-</u> E		
17				V				
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28								